REMARKS

I. Overview

These remarks are set forth in response to the Final Office Action. Presently, claims 1 through 8 and 10 through 14 are pending in the Patent Application. Claims 1 and 8 are independent in nature. In the New Non-Final Office Action, each of claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over United States Patent No. 6,563,955 to de Quieroz in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,758,110 to Boss et al. (Boss). Further, claims 1 through 4, 8 and 10 through 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0007703 by Roylance in view of Boss. Yet further, claims 6 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Quieroz and Boss and further in view of of U.S. Patent No. 6,055,017 to Shen et al. (Shen), and also over Roylance and Boss in view of Shen. Finally, claims 5 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roylance and Boss in view of Jong Whan Jang et al., Performance Evaluation of Scene Change Detection Algorithms (Jang) and also de Queiroz and Boss in view of Jang. In response, **Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 consistently with the teachings of the fidelity requirements of the shared application set forth in paragraph [0025] and Figure 2 of Applicants' originally filed Specification**.

II. The Applicant's Invention

The Applicants have invented a system, method and apparatus for the componentized configuration of a shared application server based upon varying shared

application types. In accordance with the present invention, a shared application server can be configured to interoperate with pluggable image processing logic based upon the requirements of a shared application hosted in the shared application server. Where the hosted shared application requires high fidelity imaging, pluggable image processing logic can be selected to achieve lossless image capturing and compression. By comparison, where the shared application requires high transmission speeds regardless of image fidelity, image processing logic can be selected to achieve high image compression ratios and small image packaging sizes. In this way, the characteristics of the shared application can be considered in configuring the shared application server.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 103(a)

A. Characterization of Boss

Boss claims both methods and an apparatus for task based application sharing in a graphic user interface. In Boss, a host user designates an application to be shared, referred to as a shared application. Another user at a remote location, referred to as the client user, shares control of the shared application. The shared application runs and executes only on the host system. The client system has a rectangular area on the display screen within which all shared applications are displayed. The client system renders an image of all windows of a shared application including pop-up dialogs and Menus without also displaying unshared applications. Further, both the client and the host users continue to perform normal operations outside of the shared rectangular area, and the host user defines the tasks which are to be shared.

B. Argument

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate an aspect of the invention alluded to by claim 8--namely, different pluggable image processing modules being selectable to meet fidelity requirements of a shared application comprising displayed rendered image frames of the shared application hosted in the shared application host and shared between different application sharing viewers and also mouse pointer movements in the shared application hosted in the shared application host, the fidelity requirements comprising higher speed transmission for high fidelity shared applications and lower speed transmission for low fidelity shared applications. Claim 8 similarly has been amended to be clear about the selection of an application sharing strategy according to the "fidelity requirements". On pages 6 and 7 of the Final Office Action, Examiner in passing refers only to paragraph [0029] for the teaching of "application sharing strategy ranging from high image fidelity to high speed image transmission". For the convenience of the Examiner paragraph [0029] of Roylance provides:

> [0029] By using the exemplary configuration shown in FIG. 3, image processing pipeline 200 can be configured to support a variety of image processing needs. By way of example, logic modules 306 may include half-toning modules, filtering modules, convolution modules, integrating modules, template matching modules, thresholding process modules, matrix operating modules, decoder modules, decompressor modules, coder modules, compression modules, decompression modules, and other similar image processing logic/algorithms.

Thus, it will be clear that the very specific teaching of claims 1 and 8 of:

> [E]ach of said different pluggable image processing modules being selectable to meet fidelity requirements of a shared application ... the fidelity requirements comprising higher speed transmission for high fidelity shared applications and lower speed transmission for low fidelity shared applications

is not present in Roylance. Only the selection of different image processing modules in general are taught by paragraph [0029] of Roylance.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) owing to the amended and cancelled claims and the foregoing remarks. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 23, 2010

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg, Reg. No.: 44,725
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
Customer No. 46321